

Meeting Minutes
National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
Marking Technical Committee
June 11-12, 2003 – Savannah, Georgia

- I. Introductions (see sign in sheets, attached)
 - A. New Members
 - 1. Art Breneman, PennDOT
 - 2. Roger Dyar, Spartansburg, SC
- II. Committee Business
 - A. January, 2003 minutes approved
 - B. Comments from new chair
 - 1. List serve for MTC, Chair will modify so that default condition returns message to sender
 - 2. Interested in a strategic planning group to look at long term marking issues
 - C. Research Committee liason
 - 1. Jim Kalchbrenner
- III. Summary of FHWA Chairs meeting
- IV. MTC Task Forces
 - A. Roundabouts – Joel Marcusson
 - 1. Presentation by Barry Crown
 - a) Summary of roundabout striping issues to be presented to Full Committee (Gene to confirm time)
 - 2. MTC focusing on pavement marking issues but anticipate other committees will have input on roundabout issues
 - 3. Informal principles need to be formalized as MUTCD language
 - 4. Barry Crown volunteered to review draft principles for conformity with his experience
 - 5. Overhead signs should only be used if remote from rear of queue
 - 6. Are roundabouts a traffic control device? “Roundabouts are intersections, much like traffic signals.”
 - 7. Pedestrian crash rates historically are reduced at roundabouts. Crossing issues need to consider visually impaired pedestrians
 - 8. Task force will have progress report in January
 - B. Older Driver Task Force
 - 1. J. Bremelin to reconvene task force and put recommended language in context of MUTCD
 - C. Rumble Strips Task Force – Dan Navone
 - 1. FHWA considers them geometric features, not traffic control devices
 - 2. Task force needs to address the following with recommended language for MUTCD (for January, '04):
 - a) When does a transverse rumble strip become a traffic control device?
 - b) Allowable colors?
 - c) Can they be used for lane lines?
 - 3. Rumble strips appear to be treated as tcp in Part 6 (6F.78)

4. New language recommendations target late August, '03
- D. Pavement Marking Tapers – Steve Bolt
 1. 3B.09, 3B.10, 3B.02 affected
 2. Steve to provide recommended language for January, '04
- E. Passing Lanes – Bill Lambert
 1. No report, remove from list
- F. Handicap Accessible Design – Gary Bowser
 1. Hans Jensen, Dan Navone, Jim Kalchbrenner on task force
 2. Draft Rulemaking for accessibility in public rights of way does not specifically address pavement marking language
 3. Detectable warnings will ultimately be in the MUTCD (per E. Huckaby)

V. Presentations

- A. Barry Crown – Roundabout striping, etc.
- B. Janet Barlow – Accessible Pedestrian Signals
 1. Street crossings for blind/visually impaired without accessible pedestrian signals, pedestrians need physical clue (pedestrian fences) to know where NOT to cross
 2. There are different cane techniques. Some keep cane along pavement, others bring it up and down
 3. Pedestrians who are blind determine direction by listening for traffic
 4. Alignment of crosswalks is important for blind pedestrians
- C. Janet Barlow – Detectable Warning Devices
 1. Detectable warnings are intended to be a STOP sign
 2. Truncated dome pattern and texture is only pattern deemed detectable by research
 3. Detectable warnings are two feet at curb line, no longer full ramp
 4. Truncated dome dimensions are defined in accessibility guidelines
 5. Color of Detectable Warnings is currently not defined, except that it need provide contrast
 6. Winter maintenance/material options
 7. www.accessforblind.org for Powerpoint presentations

VI. Activity Reports

- A. MUTCD Older Driver Pocket Guide – Ernie Huckaby
 1. Still under development
- B. No Passing Zone Markings at RR Crossing - Duane Thomas (absent)
 1. Jim Ellison coordinated with the Railroad TC to resolve centerline striping question.
- C. Do Not Block Intersection – Jim Ellison
 1. In figure, remove DO NOT BLOCK lines in opposite direction, by majority vote
 2. DO NOT BLOCK markings in figure to reflect the two through lanes only, by majority vote
 3. Line markings for box are 8” minimum, and for grid lines are 4” minimum, by majority vote
 4. DO NOT BLOCK markings (outside box) should be extensions of the intersecting street pavement edge, by majority vote

5. Jim to revise text and figure to reflect above changes and provide to Gene for submission to sponsors
 - D. Staggered STOP lines – Ross Airomloo
 1. Add option to first Standard, 3B.16
 2. Proposed changes address George Murdoch’s request and FHWA Older Driver Guidelines recommendations
 - E. Yellow-Green Crosswalk Markings
 1. Agenda item for January, ’04 to determine if MTC should draft language for Part 3 to address yellow-green crosswalk markings
 - F. Urbanization Issues – Dan Centa
 1. Dan looking for task force volunteers
 2. Transverse lines to mark start and end of school zones
 - a) Art to canvass State Traffic Engineers about current practice
 - b) Darryl to canvass APWA
 - c) Action by MTC should only be if there is substantial feedback
 3. Guidance for location and placement of blue RPM’s for hydrants
 - a) Dan to draft language for January, ’04
 - G. Yield Line used for left turn lane on divided highways – Gene Hawkins (for Duane Thomas)
 1. Poor practice, not recommended by MTC
 - H. Measurement of crosswalk width – Gene Hawkins (for Dave Woodin)
 - I. Diagonal markings on shoulder at road width transition – Gene Hawkins
 1. No action
 - J. “Look Both Ways” with corresponding eyeballs symbols
 1. No action
 - K. End-of Roadway Marker Mounting Height - Jim Ellison
 1. Marker covered in Section 3C, measured to the bottom of sign
 - L. Colored Pavements (color issues) - Steve Bolt
 1. Steve to speak with Richard Moeur
 2. Green previously approved by MTC for bike lanes
 - M. Single vs. Double Delineators – Tim Taylor
 1. Coordinate with Paul Carlson research of State agency practice
 - N. FHWA letters – No MTC action necessary
 - O. ASTM report – Neil Hodson
 - P. Pedestrian task force – Dan Centa
 1. YIELD lines with “Yield here for pedestrians in crosswalk” sign
 - a) MTC to review draft language, January, ’04
 - b) Primary value is the markings, recommend that markings may be allowed without sign
- VII. National Committee Chair Meeting summary – Gene Hawkins
- A. Final rule expected in October
 1. 30 day comment period
 2. When final rule is available, Gene to use list serve to solicit volunteers to review parts for errata
 - B. Proposed language for roundabouts, Part 2
 - C. Looking to make Standard Highway Signs consistent with MUTCD

- D. Pocket guide for Older Drivers due from FHWA soon
- VIII. New Business
 - A. Skid resistance markings
 - 1. Even resistance across surfaces is as important as skid resistance values of any one surface
 - 2. Bike community has been addressing issue for years (B. McMillen)
 - a) Gene will discuss with Bicycle Technical Committee
 - 3. MTC unanimous that skid resistance of markings is not a markings issue
 - B. Older Driver pocket guide issues will be forwarded to committee for comment prior to Fall release
 - C. Compatibility of illustrations in MUTCD with Standard Highway Signs book (especially alphabet used in signs) – Gene and Hans to coordinate with Fred Ranck, FHWA
- IX. Wrap up
 - A. Review activities to be completed before the next meeting
 - 1. Items will be on web site
 - B. Process for FHWA letter review
 - 1. Would like to find a way to post letters on web site
 - C. Prepare Agenda for next meeting
 - 1. Initially deal with sponsor comments
 - 2. Task forces to present recommended MUTCD language